

# OPERATOR-VALUED DISTRIBUTIONS. I. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF FREENESS

ALEXANDRU NICA\*, DIMITRI SHLYAKHTENKO†, AND ROLAND SPEICHER\*

ABSTRACT. Let  $M$  be a  $B$ -probability space. Assume that  $B$  itself is a  $D$ -probability space; then  $M$  can be viewed as  $D$ -probability space as well. Let  $X \in M$ . We look at the question of relating the properties of  $X$  as  $B$ -valued random variable to its properties as  $D$ -valued random variable. We characterize freeness of  $X$  from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ : (a) in terms of a certain factorization condition linking the  $B$ -valued and  $D$ -valued cumulants of  $X$ , and (b) for  $D$  finite-dimensional, in terms of linking the  $B$ -valued and the  $D$ -valued Fisher information of  $X$ . We give an application to random matrices. For the second characterization we derive a new operator-valued description of the conjugate variable and introduce an operator-valued version of the liberation gradient.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Free probability theory is a non-commutative probability theory where the classical concept of independence is replaced by the notion of "freeness". This theory, due to Voiculescu, was introduced as a tool for investigating the structure of von Neumann algebras arising from free product constructions. This programme has been very succesful and has yielded a wealth of new and unexpected results about this class of von Neumann algebras.

From the very beginning, Voiculescu introduced also an operator-valued version of freeness – where the role of the "constants"  $\mathbb{C}$  is taken over by an arbitrary fixed algebra  $B$  and where the states are replaced by conditional expectations onto  $B$ . This more general frame enlarges the domain of applicability of free probability techniques in a tremendous way. Of course, this wider domain of applicability is compensated by the fact that it is harder to obtain results in the operator-valued case. However, quite astonishingly, a lot of the scalar-valued theory, in particular its combinatorial description resting on the notion of cumulants, can be transfered to the operator-valued context.

A systematic exploration about how much of the scalar-valued results can be generalized to the operator-valued setting is still lacking. However, instead of pursuing such a generalization for its own sake, we will develop here those aspects of such a programme which are related to one of the most exciting possibilities available in the operator-valued framework: the possibility of switching between two different algebras of "scalars". Namely if the algebra  $A$  is simultaneously a  $B$ -probability space and a  $D$ -probability space for some subalgebras  $D$  and  $B$  of  $A$ , then an element  $X$

---

\* Research supported by a grant of NSERC, Canada.

†Research supported by an NSF postdoctoral fellowship, by NSF grant DMS-0102332, and by a Sloan Foundation Fellowship.

in  $A$  is at the same time a  $B$ - and a  $D$ -valued random variable, and one can ask how these different points of view towards  $X$  are related. Let us assume that  $D \subset B$ . Then, in principle, the  $B$ -valued distribution of  $X$  determines also the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X$ . However, this connection is similar in complexity to saying that the entries of a matrix determine its eigenvalues. What we are looking for are treatable and interesting special cases where something more explicit can be said.

Note that such questions are also of practical relevance, since in concrete cases one might be interested in the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X$ , however, direct arguments only give information about its  $B$ -valued distribution. Then it is of great importance to have general theorems about closing the gap between  $B$  and  $D$ .

In this article we will consider the most fundamental special case, namely when  $X$  is free from  $B$  over  $D$ . We will show that this freeness condition can equivalently be characterized in terms of cumulants and in terms of free Fisher information.

In Section 2, we will recall some preliminaries about operator-valued free probability theory, in particular the concepts of cumulants and canonical random variables.

Section 3 deals with our first main result: freeness from a subalgebra  $B$  can be characterized by a factorization property of the  $B$ -valued cumulants. We also give an interesting application of this circle of ideas to Gaussian random band matrices.

The rest of the paper deals with our second characterization of freeness from  $B$  over  $D$ , in the case of finite-dimensional  $D$ . The question which we address is whether equality of the free Fisher information with respect to  $D$  and the free Fisher information with respect to  $B$  implies freeness from  $B$  over  $D$ . A more suggestive form of this question might be the following version: If we know that the free entropy of a random variable  $X$  conditioned on random variables  $Y$  and  $Z$  is the same as the free entropy of  $X$  conditioned on  $Z$ , does this imply that  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally free over  $Z$ ? (This is related to the previous questions by setting  $B = W^*(Y, Z)$  and  $D = W^*(Z)$ .)

For the case  $D = \mathbb{C}$  the above question was solved in the affirmative by Voiculescu [11], but the general case remained open. We are able to extend the affirmative solution of Voiculescu to the case where  $D$  is finite-dimensional.

In Section 4, we recall the concepts of relative Fisher information and conjugate variables. Our main result in this section is a reformulation of the characterizing equations for conjugate variables in terms of operator-valued cumulants.

Our main tool for addressing the above mentioned problem on Fisher informations is an operator-valued generalization of the liberation gradient, which we will define in Section 5. Again, we give an interesting reformulation of it in terms of cumulants and, for the case of finite-dimensional  $D$ , we prove a relation between the liberation gradient and corresponding conjugate variables.

These results are used in Section 6 for proving, in the case of finite-dimensional  $D$ , our second main characterization for freeness from a subalgebra. We will also reformulate this result as a minimization result for free Fisher information or a maximization result for free entropy. Finally, we treat as a concrete example of such a maximization result the case of  $R$ -cyclic elements.

A preliminary version of sections 2 and 3 of this paper has appeared as MSRI-preprint 2001-001. The authors gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of MSRI during its 2000-2001 program in operator algebras.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1.  $B$ -probability space.** Let  $B$  be a unital algebra. Recall that a  $B$ -probability space  $(M, E : M \rightarrow B)$  (see e.g. [12], [8]) is a pair consisting of an algebra  $M$  containing  $B$  as a unital subalgebra, and a *conditional expectation*  $E : M \rightarrow B$ . In other words,  $E : M \rightarrow B$  is unital and  $B$ -bilinear:

$$E(1) = 1, \quad E(bmb') = bE(m)b', \quad \forall b, b' \in B, \forall m \in M.$$

Elements of  $M$  are called  $B$ -valued random variables.

**2.2. Multiplicative functions.** Recall that a  $B$ -balanced map  $\langle \cdots \rangle : \bigcup M^n \rightarrow B$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -multilinear map, (i.e., a sequence of maps  $M^n \ni m_1, \dots, m_n \mapsto \langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle \in B$ ) satisfying the  $B$ -linearity conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \langle bm_1, \dots, m_n \rangle &= b \langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle \\ \langle m_1, \dots, m_nb \rangle &= \langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle b \\ \langle m_1, \dots, m_kb, m_{k+1}, \dots, m_n \rangle &= \langle m_1, \dots, m_k, bm_{k+1}, \dots, m_n \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(Here  $m_i \in M$ ,  $b \in B$ ).

Given a non-crossing partition  $\pi \in NC(n)$  and an arbitrary  $B$ -balanced map  $\langle \cdots \rangle$ , we can construct a corresponding *multiplicative map* or *bracketing*, denoted by  $\langle \cdots \rangle_\pi$ , which is a map  $M^n \rightarrow B$  and is defined recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m_1, \dots, m_k \rangle_{1_k} &= \langle m_1, \dots, m_k \rangle \\ \langle m_1, \dots, m_k \rangle_{\pi \sqcup \rho} &= \langle m_1, \dots, m_p \rangle_\pi \cdot \langle m_{p+1}, \dots, m_k \rangle_\rho \\ \langle m_1, \dots, m_k \rangle_{\text{ins}(p, \rho \rightarrow \pi)} &= \langle m_1, \dots, m_p \langle m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{p+q} \rangle_\rho, m_{p+q+1}, \dots, m_k \rangle_\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $1_k$  denotes the partition with the sole class  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\pi \sqcup \rho$  denotes disjoint union (with the equivalence classes of  $\rho$  placed after those of  $\pi$ ), and  $\text{ins}(p, \rho \rightarrow \pi)$  denotes the partition obtained from  $\pi$  by inserting the partition  $\rho$  after the  $p$ -th element of the set on which  $\pi$  determines a partition.

In other words, each partition  $\pi$  is interpreted as a recipe for placing brackets  $\langle \cdots \rangle$ , and  $\langle \cdots \rangle_\pi$  is the value of the resulting expression.

**2.3. Moments and  $R$ -transform.** The  $B$ -probability space structure of the algebra  $M$  gives rise to one example of such a multiplicative map, namely, the *moments map*

$$\mu^B : \bigcup M^n \rightarrow B,$$

given by

$$(2.1) \quad \mu^B(m_1, \dots, m_n) = E(m_1 \cdots m_n).$$

The reason for the name is that, having fixed  $B$ -random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_p \in M$ , the following values of  $\mu^B$ ,

$$\mu^B(b_0 X_{i_1} b_1, \dots, X_{i_{n-1}} b_{n-1}, X_{i_n} b_n) = E(b_0 X_{i_1} b_1 \cdots X_{i_{n-1}} b_{n-1} X_{i_n} b_n)$$

are called *B-valued moments* of the family  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .

In [8] and [9] the notion of *B-valued R-transform* was introduced (we follow the combinatorial approach of [8], see also [7]). Like the map  $\mu^B$ , the *R-transform* map is a multiplicative map

$$\kappa^B : \bigcup M^n \rightarrow B.$$

The following combinatorial formula ("moment-cumulant formula") actually determines  $\kappa^B$  uniquely:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^B(m_1, \dots, m_n) &= E(m_1 \cdots m_n) \\ (2.2) \quad &= \sum \text{all possible bracketings involving } \kappa^B(\cdots) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in NC(n)} \kappa_\pi^B(m_1, \dots, m_n). \end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness of the definition can be easily seen by observing that the right-hand side of the equation above involves  $\kappa^B(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  and that the rest of the terms are products of factors of smaller order (i.e., restrictions of  $\kappa^B$  to  $M^k$ ,  $k < n$ ).

It is important to note that  $\mu^B$  determines  $\kappa^B$  and vice-versa. Moreover, the value of  $\mu^B|_{M^n}$  depends only on  $\kappa^B|_{M \cup \dots \cup M^n}$ , and vice-versa.

**2.4. Moment and cumulant series.** Suppose that we are given a *B*-balanced function  $\langle \cdots \rangle : \bigcup M^k \rightarrow B$ , and that on the other hand we only want to focus our attention to a given family  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  of elements of  $M$ . Then what we have to look at is the family of multilinear maps

$$M_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{\langle \cdots \rangle} : B^{k-1} \rightarrow B, \quad i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

defined by

$$M_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{\langle \cdots \rangle}(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}) = \langle X_{i_1} b_1, \dots, b_{k-1} X_{i_k} \rangle.$$

In the particular examples above, we get the *moment series* of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n} := M_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^\mu$$

and the *cumulant series*,

$$(2.4) \quad k_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n} := M_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^\kappa.$$

We will sometimes write

$$k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}$$

to emphasize that the series is valued in  $B$ .

**2.5. Freeness with amalgamation.** Let  $M_1, M_2 \subset M$  be two subalgebras, each containing  $B$ . Freeness of  $M_1, M_2$  with amalgamation over  $B$  is defined in the same way as the usual (scalar-valued) freeness, one just has to replace the state  $\tau$  by the conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow B$ . We refer to [12] for details. The importance of the *B*-valued *R-transform* in the context of freeness with amalgamation over  $B$  is apparent from the following theorem ([8], see also [1]):

**Theorem.** *Let  $S_1, S_2$  be two subsets of  $M$ . Let  $M_i$  be the algebra generated by  $S_i$  and  $B$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are free with amalgamation over  $B$  iff whenever  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in S_1 \cup S_2$ ,*

$$\kappa^B(X_1, \dots, X_n) = 0$$

*unless either all  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in S_1$ , or all  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in S_2$ .*

Note that the above theorem makes a statement only if  $n \geq 2$ .

**2.6. Canonical random variables.** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  be fixed.

Then by [9] there exists a  $B$ -probability space  $(\mathcal{F}, E_B : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow B)$ , elements  $\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_n^* \in \mathcal{F}$ , and elements  $\lambda_p^k$  ( $1 \leq p \leq n, k \geq 0$ ) satisfying the following properties:

- (i)  $\lambda_{j_1}^* b_1 \lambda_{j_2}^* b_2 \dots \lambda_{j_k}^* b_k \lambda_j^k = k_{j_1, \dots, j_k, j}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(b_1, \dots, b_k)$ ,  $b_1, \dots, b_k \in B$ ;
- (ii) Let  $w = b_0 a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \dots a_n b_n$ , where  $b_i \in B$ ,  $a_i = \lambda_p^k$  or  $a_i = \lambda_p^*$ . Then  $E_B(w) = 0$  unless  $w$  can be reduced to an element of  $B$  using relation 2.6(i).

The construction of the elements  $\lambda_p^k$  puts in particular  $\lambda_p^0 = E_B(X_p) \in B$ . We should clarify that for each  $k$ ,  $\lambda_p^k$  is just a formal variable, and we do not assume any relations between  $\{\lambda_p^k\}_{k,p}$ ; for example,  $\lambda_p^k$  is not the  $k$ -th power of  $\lambda_p^1$ .

It is not hard to show that the properties listed above determine the restriction of  $E_B$  to the algebra generated by  $\{\lambda_p^*\}_p$  and  $\{\lambda_p^k\}_{p,k}$ , and  $B$ .

Let

$$Y_j = \lambda_j^* + \sum_{k \geq 0} \lambda_j^k.$$

(This series is formal; however,  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  have moments, since each such moment involves only a finite number of terms from the series defining  $Y_j$ ).

The point of this construction is that we have:

$$k_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n} = k_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{Y_1, \dots, Y_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n} = \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{Y_1, \dots, Y_n}.$$

In other words, given a cumulant series,  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  is an explicit family of  $B$ -valued random variables, whose cumulant series is equal to the one given.

### 3. FREEDOM FROM A SUBALGEBRA AND FACTORIZATION OF CUMULANTS.

**3.1.  $D$ -cumulants vs.  $B$ -cumulants.** Let now  $D \subset B$  be a unital subalgebra, and let  $F : B \rightarrow D$  be a conditional expectation. If  $(M, E : M \rightarrow B)$  is a  $B$ -probability space, then  $(M, F \circ E : M \rightarrow D)$  is a  $D$ -probability space.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$ . Assume that the  $B$ -valued cumulants of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  satisfy*

$$(3.1) \quad k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(d_1, \dots, d_{k-1}) \in D, \quad \forall k \geq 1, \forall d_1, \dots, d_{k-1} \in D.$$

*Then the  $D$ -valued cumulants of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are given by the restrictions of the  $B$ -valued cumulants:*

$$(3.2) \quad k_{D; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(d_1, \dots, d_{k-1}) = k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(d_1, \dots, d_{k-1}), \quad \forall k \geq 1, \forall d_1, \dots, d_{k-1} \in D.$$

*Proof.* Let  $N$  be the algebra generated by  $D$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . The condition on cumulants implies that

$$\kappa^B|_{\cup N^p}$$

is valued in  $D$ . It follows from the moment-cumulant formula (2.2) that  $\mu^B|_{N^p}$  is valued in  $D$ , and hence (by the simple observation that in general  $\mu^D = F(\mu^B)$ ) that

$$\mu^D|_{N^p} = \mu^B|_{N^p} = \sum_{\pi \in NC(p)} \kappa_\pi^B|_{\cup N^p}.$$

Since the moment-cumulant formula determines  $\kappa^D|_{\cup N^p}$ , it follows that

$$\kappa^D|_{\cup N^p} = \kappa^B|_{\cup N^p}.$$

□

We record an equivalent formulation of the theorem above (which was implicit in the proof):

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $N \subset M$  be a subalgebra, containing  $D$ . Assume that  $\kappa^B|_{\cup N^p}$  is valued in  $D$ . Then*

$$(3.3) \quad \kappa^D|_{\cup N^p} = \kappa^B|_{\cup N^p}.$$

In general, in the absence of the condition that  $k_B^{X_1, \dots, X_n}$  restricted to  $\cup D^p$  is valued in  $D$ , the expression of  $D$ -valued cumulants of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  in terms of the  $B$ -valued cumulants is quite complicated. Note, for example, that if  $X$  is a  $B$ -valued random variable, and  $b \in B$ , then the  $B$ -valued cumulant series of  $bX$  are very easy to describe. On the other hand, the  $D$ -valued cumulant series of  $bX$  can have a very complicated expression in terms of the  $D$ -valued cumulant series of  $X$  and  $b$ .

In spite of its apparent simplicity, Theorem 3.1 has non-trivial applications. One kind of application appears, e.g., in the following type of situation: We are interested in the  $D$ -valued cumulants for a certain  $D$ , but there is no nice general formula for calculating  $D$ -valued cumulants. However, we can find a larger algebra  $B$ , containing  $D$ , where there is a nice formula for  $B$ -valued cumulants. Then Theorem 3.1 serves us with special situations when the desired  $D$ -valued cumulants can nevertheless be computed. Situations like this occur, for example, in the context of R-cyclic elements, as considered in [3].

The sufficient condition in the theorem above is actually quite close to being necessary in the case that the conditional expectations are positive maps of  $*$ -algebras. As an illustration, consider the case that  $D \subset B$  consists of scalar multiples of 1, and  $F : B \rightarrow D$  is such that  $\tau = F \circ E$  is a *trace* on  $M$ , satisfying  $\tau(xy) = \tau(yx)$  for all  $x, y \in M$ .

Recall that  $X$  is called a  $B$ -semicircular variable if its cumulant series is given by

$$(3.4) \quad \underbrace{k_{B;1, \dots, 1}^X}_p(b_1, \dots, b_{p-1}) = \kappa^B(X, b_1 X, \dots, b_{p-1} X) = \delta_{p,2} \eta(b_1)$$

for some map  $\eta : B \rightarrow B$ . It is easily seen that if  $X$  is  $B$ -semicircular, then  $\eta(b) = E(XbX)$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $(M, E : M \rightarrow B)$  be a  $B$ -probability space, such that  $M$  and  $B$  are  $C^*$ -algebras. Let  $F : B \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = D \subset B$  be a faithful state. Assume that  $\tau = F \circ E$  is a faithful trace on  $M$ . Let  $X$  be a  $B$ -semicircular variable in  $M$ . Then the distribution of  $X$  with respect to  $\tau$  is the semicircle law iff  $E(X^2) \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $E(X^2) = k_{B;11}^X(1) \in \mathbb{C}$ , it follows that the  $B$ -valued cumulants of  $X$ , restricted to  $D = \mathbb{C}$  are valued in  $D$ . Hence by Theorem 3.2, the  $D$ -valued cumulant series of  $X$  are the same as the restriction of the  $B$ -valued cumulant series; hence the only scalar-valued cumulant of  $X$  which is nonzero is the second cumulant  $k_{11}^X$ , so that the distribution of  $X$  is the semicircle law.

Conversely, assume that the distribution of  $X$  is the semicircle law. Let  $\eta(b) = \kappa^B(X, bX) = E(XbX)$ ,  $b \in B$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau(\eta(1))^2 &= 2\tau(X^2)^2 \\ &= \tau(X^4) \\ &= F \circ E(X^4) \end{aligned}$$

Using the  $B$ -valued moment-cumulant formula for  $X$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} E(X^4) &= \mu^B(X, X, X, X) \\ &= \kappa^B(X \kappa^B(X, X), X) + \kappa^B(X, X) \kappa^B(X, X) \\ &= \eta(\eta(1)) + \eta(1)\eta(1), \end{aligned}$$

and we can continue the above calculation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau(\eta(1))^2 &= F(\eta(\eta(1))) + F(\eta(1)\eta(1)) \\ &= \tau(X\eta(1)X) + \tau(\eta(1)^2) \\ &= \tau(\eta(1)XX) + \tau(\eta(1)^2) \\ &= 2\tau(\eta(1)^2), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\tau(\eta(1)) = \tau(\eta(1)^2)^{1/2}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have that if  $\eta(1) \notin \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\tau(\eta(1)) = \langle \eta(1), 1 \rangle < \|\eta(1)\|_2 \cdot \|1\|_2 = \tau(\eta(1)^2)^{1/2},$$

which is a contradiction. Hence  $\eta(1) \in \mathbb{C}$ .  $\square$

We mention a corollary, which is of interest to random matrix theory. Let  $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(y, x)$  be a non-negative function on  $[0, 1]^2$ , having at most a finite number of discontinuities in each vertical line. Let  $G(n)$  be an  $n \times n$  random matrix with entries  $g_{ij}$ , so that  $\{g_{ij} : i \leq j\}$  are independent complex Gaussian random variables,  $g_{ij} = \overline{g_{ji}}$ , the expectation  $E(g_{ij}) = 0$  and the variance  $E(|g_{ij}|^2) = \frac{1}{n}\sigma(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n})$ . The matrices  $G(n)$  are called Gaussian Random Band Matrices. Let  $\mu_n$  be the expected eigenvalue distribution of  $G(n)$ , i.e.,

$$\mu_n([a, b]) = \frac{1}{n} \times \text{expected number of eigenvalues of } G(n) \text{ in } [a, b].$$

**Corollary 3.4.** *The eigenvalue distribution measures  $\mu_n$  of the Gaussian Random Band Matrices  $G(n)$  converge weakly to the semicircle law iff  $\int_0^1 \sigma(x, y) dy$  is a.e. a constant, independent of  $x$ .*

The proof of this relies on a result from [4], showing that  $G(n)$  has limit eigenvalue distribution  $\mu$ , given as follows. Let  $X$  be the  $L^\infty[0, 1]$ -semicircular variable in an  $L^\infty[0, 1]$ -probability space  $(M, E : M \rightarrow L^\infty[0, 1])$ , so that  $E(XfX)(x) = \int_0^1 f(y)\sigma(x, y)dy$ . Let  $F : L^\infty[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  denote the linear functional  $F(f) = \int_0^1 f(x)dx$ , and denote by  $\tau$  the trace  $F \circ E$  on  $W^*(X, L^\infty[0, 1])$ . Then  $\mu$  is the scalar-valued distribution of  $X$  with respect to  $\tau$ , i.e.,

$$\int t^k d\mu(t) = \tau(X^k).$$

It remains to apply Theorem 3.3, to conclude that  $\mu$  is a semicircle law iff  $E(X^2) \in \mathbb{C}$ , i.e.,  $\int_0^1 \sigma(x, y)dy$  is a constant function of  $x$ .

**3.2. A characterization of freeness.** We are now ready to state the first main result of this note. The following theorem was earlier proved for  $B$ -valued semicircular variables in [5], and found many uses in operator algebra theory.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$ . Assume that  $F : B \rightarrow D$  satisfies the faithfulness condition that if  $b_1 \in B$  and if  $F(b_1 b_2) = 0$  for all  $b_2 \in B$ , then  $b_1 = 0$ . Then  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  iff their  $B$ -valued cumulant series satisfies*

$$(3.5) \quad k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}) = F(k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(F(b_1), \dots, F(b_{k-1}))).$$

for all  $b_1, \dots, b_{k-1} \in B$ . In short,  $k = F \circ k \circ F$ . (Here the cumulant series are computed in the  $B$ -probability space  $(M, E : M \rightarrow B)$ ). Equivalently,

$$(3.6) \quad k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}) = k_{D; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(F(b_1), \dots, F(b_{k-1})).$$

We note that in the case that  $M$  is a  $C^*$ -probability space, the faithfulness assumption above is exactly the condition that the GNS representation of  $B$  with respect to the conditional expectation  $F$  is faithful.

Note also that the two characterizations in terms of cumulants appearing in the above theorem are of a different nature: Eq. (3.5) is a condition ("factorization") on the  $B$ -valued cumulants, whereas Eq. (3.6) is a statement about the relation between  $B$ -valued and  $D$ -valued cumulants. The equivalence of these two formulations is easily seen with the help of Theorem 3.1.

Since  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  iff the algebra  $N$  generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $D$  is free from  $B$  over  $D$ , the theorem above can be equivalently stated as

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $N \subset M$  be a subalgebra of  $M$ , containing  $D$ . Assume that  $F : B \rightarrow D$  satisfies the faithfulness condition that if  $b_1 \in B$  and if  $F(b_1 b_2) = 0$  for all  $b_2 \in B$ , then  $b_1 = 0$ . Then  $N$  is free from  $B$  over  $D$  iff*

$$(3.7) \quad \kappa^B(n_1 b_1, n_2 b_2, \dots, n_k) = F(\kappa^B(n_1 F(b_1), n_2 F(b_2), \dots, n_k))$$



for all  $k$  and all  $n_1, \dots, n_k \in N$ ,  $b_1, \dots, b_{k-1} \in B$ . Equivalently,

$$(3.8) \quad \kappa^B(n_1 b_1, n_2 b_2, \dots, n_k) = \kappa^D(n_1 F(b_1), n_2 F(b_2), \dots, n_k).$$

*Proof.* We prove the theorem in the first formulation.

Assume that the condition (3.5) is satisfied by the cumulant series of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be as in Section 2.6. Since the freeness of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  is a condition on the  $B$ -moment series of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  have the same  $B$ -moment series as  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , it is sufficient to prove that  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathcal{F}$  are free with amalgamation over  $D$  from  $B$ .

Since (3.5) is satisfied,  $\lambda_j^0 = E_B(Y_j) \in D$  and hence  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  belong to the algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  generated in  $\mathcal{F}$  by  $\lambda_j^*$  and  $\lambda_p^q$ ,  $1 \leq j, p \leq n$ ,  $q \geq 1$  and  $D$ . Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that  $\mathcal{L}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

Let  $w_1, \dots, w_s \in \mathcal{L}$ , so that  $F \circ E_B(w_j) = 0$ , and let  $b_0, \dots, b_s \in B$ , so that  $F(b_j) = 0$  (allowing also  $b_0$  and/or  $b_s$  to be equal to 1). We must prove that

$$F \circ E_B(b_0 w_1 b_1 \cdots w_s b_s) = 0.$$

Note that the factorization condition (3.5) as well as the definition of the generators of  $\mathcal{L}$  (see 2.6(i) and 2.6(ii)) imply that  $E_B|_{\mathcal{L}}$  has values in  $D$ . It follows that we may assume that  $E_B(w_j) = 0$  (since  $F \circ E_B(w_j) = E_B(w_j) \in D$ ). By the definition of  $E_B$ , its kernel is spanned by irreducible non-trivial words in the generators  $\lambda_j^*$  and  $\lambda_p^q$ . Then

$$W = b_0 w_1 \cdots w_s b_s$$

is again a linear combination of words in the generators  $\lambda_j^*$  and  $\lambda_p^q$ . By linearity, we may reduce to the case that  $W$  is a single word. If  $W$  is irreducible, it must be non-trivial (since each  $w_i$  is non-trivial), hence  $E_B(W) = 0$ , so that  $F \circ E_B(W) = 0$ . So assume that  $W$  is not irreducible. Since each  $w_i$  is irreducible, this means that  $W$  contains a sub-word of the form

$$\begin{aligned} W &= W_1 \cdot d_0 \lambda_{i_1}^* d_1 \lambda_{i_2}^* d_2 \cdots \\ &\quad d_s b_1 d_{s+1} \lambda_{i_{s+2}}^* \cdots b_j \cdots \lambda_{i_k}^* d_k b_r d_{k+1} \lambda_{i_{k+1}}^* \\ &\quad \cdots d_p \lambda_{i_p}^* d_{p+1} \lambda_j^p \cdot W_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the relation (2.6(i)) and the factorization condition (3.5), we get that

$$W = W_1 d_0 k_{i_1, \dots, i_p, j}(d_1, \dots, F(d_k b_r d_{k+1}), \dots, d_{p+1}) W_2 = 0,$$

since  $F(d_k b_r d_{k+1}) = d_k F(b_r) d_{k+1} = 0$ . Thus in any case,  $F \circ E_B(W) = 0$ .

We have therefore seen that the factorization condition implies freeness with amalgamation.

To prove the other implication, assume that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are free with amalgamation over  $D$  from  $B$ . Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  be  $B$ -valued random variables, so that

$$k_{B; i_1, \dots, i_k}^{Z_1, \dots, Z_n}(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}) = F(k_{D, i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(F(b_1), \dots, F(b_{k-1}))).$$

where  $k_D$  denote  $D$ -valued cumulants. (Note that the first occurrence of  $F$  is actually redundant, as  $k_{D, i_1, \dots, i_k}^{X_1, \dots, X_n}(F(b_1), \dots, F(b_{k-1})) \in D$ ). Then by the first part of the proof,  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  are free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ . Moreover, by Theorem 3.2, the

$D$ -valued distributions of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are the same. By assumption,  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are free with amalgamation over  $D$  from  $B$ . This freeness, together with the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , determines their  $B$ -valued distribution. Indeed, the freeness assumptions determine

$$F \circ E(b'b_0X_{i_1}b_1X_{i_2} \cdots b_{n-1}X_{i_n}b_n), \quad b', b_i \in B$$

which in view of the assumptions on  $F$  determines

$$E(b_0X_{i_1}b_1X_{i_2} \cdots b_{n-1}X_{i_n}b_n), \quad b_i \in B.$$

It follows that the  $B$ -valued distributions of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  coincide. Hence the  $B$ -valued cumulants of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  satisfy (3.5).  $\square$

As an application, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $N \subset M$  be a subalgebra. Let  $D \subset C \subset B \subset M$  be subalgebras, and  $E_C : M \rightarrow C$ ,  $E_B : M \rightarrow B$ ,  $E_D : M \rightarrow D$  be conditional expectations, so that  $E_D = E_D \circ E_C$ ,  $E_C = E_C \circ E_B$ . Assume that  $E_C|_B : B \rightarrow C$ ,  $E_D|_C : C \rightarrow D$  and  $E_D|_B : B \rightarrow D$  satisfy the faithfulness assumptions of Theorem 3.5. Assume that  $N$  is free from  $C$  with amalgamation over  $D$ , and also free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $C$ . Then  $N$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $N$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $C$ , we have that for all  $n_j \in N$  and  $b_j \in B$ ,

$$\kappa^B(n_1b_1, n_2b_2, \dots, n_k) = \kappa^C(n_1E_C(b_1), \dots, n_k).$$

Since  $N$  is free from  $C$  with amalgamation over  $D$ , we get similarly that for all  $c_j \in C$ ,

$$\kappa^C(n_1c_1, n_2c_2, \dots, n_k) = \kappa^D(n_1E_D(c_1), \dots, n_k).$$

Applying this with  $c_j = E_C(b_j)$  and combining with the previous equation gives

$$\kappa^B(n_1b_1, n_2b_2, \dots, n_k) = \kappa^D(n_1E_D(b_1), \dots, n_k),$$

since  $E_D = E_D \circ E_C$ . Hence  $N$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .  $\square$

In general, for operator-valued random variables  $X$  and  $Y$ , freeness over  $B$  and freeness over  $D$  are not implying each other in a straightforward manner. What can be said in general is that freeness of  $B\langle X \rangle$  from  $Y$  over  $D$  implies freeness of  $X$  from  $Y$  over  $B$  (compare [6, Lemma 2.6]). It is therefore interesting to note that the above proposition provides us with a situation where we also get the reverse implication.

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space (i.e.,  $M$  is a von Neumann algebra and  $\tau : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  a faithful and normal trace). Let  $D \subset B \subset M$  be two von Neumann subalgebras and consider two selfadjoint random variables  $X, Y \in M$ . Assume that  $Y$  is free from  $B$  over  $D$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  and  $Y$  are free with amalgamation over  $B$ .
- (ii)  $B\langle X \rangle$  and  $Y$  are free with amalgamation over  $D$ .

Of course, all freeness statements above are with respect to the unique trace-preserving conditional expectations.

*Proof.* That freeness over  $D$  implies freeness over  $B$  is the statement of Lemma 2.6 of [6]. The reverse implication is a direct application of our Prop. 3.7. One should note that the faithfulness assumptions are automatically fulfilled in our frame, where all conditional expectations are compatible with the faithful state  $\tau$ .  $\square$

Let us also mention the following corollary of Prop. 3.7.

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $D \subset C \subset B$  be  $C^*$ -algebras,  $E_D^N : N \rightarrow D$ ,  $E_D^C : C \rightarrow D$  and  $E_C^B : B \rightarrow C$  be conditional expectations, having faithful GNS representations. Consider the reduced free product*

$$(((N, E_D^N) *_D (C, E_D^C)), E_D^N * id) *_C (B, E_C^B),$$

where  $E_D^N * id$  denotes the canonical conditional expectation from the free product  $(N, E_D^N) *_D (C, E_D^C)$  onto  $C$ . Then

$$(3.9) \quad (((N, E_D^N) *_D (C, E_D^C)), E_D^N * id) *_C (B, E_C^B) \cong (N, E_D^N) *_D (B, E_D^C \circ E_C^B).$$

*Proof.* To see this, it is sufficient to prove that  $N \subset (((N, E_D^N) *_D (C, E_D^C)), E_D^N * id) *_C (B, E_C^B)$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ , since both  $(N, E_D^N) *_D (C, E_D^C)$  and  $(N, E_D^N) *_D (B, E_D^C \circ E_C^B)$  are generated by  $N$  and  $B$  as  $C^*$ -algebras. But  $N$  is free from  $B$  over  $C$ , and from  $C$  over  $B$ , by construction. Hence by the proposition above,  $N$  is free from  $B$  over  $D$ .  $\square$

#### 4. RELATIVE FISHER INFORMATION AND CONJUGATE VARIABLES WITH RESPECT TO A SUBALGEBRA

**4.1. Basic definitions.** From now on we will work in a *tracial  $W^*$ -probability space*  $(M, \tau)$ , i.e.  $M$  is a von Neumann algebra and  $\tau : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  a faithful and normal trace. For given subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_p \subset M$ , we will denote by  $L^2(S_1, \dots, S_p)$  the closure of the von Neumann subalgebra generated by all  $S_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, p$ ) in the  $L^2$ -norm of  $\tau$ , i.e.  $\|a\|_{L^2}^2 = \tau(aa^*)$ . (Usually, the sets  $S_i$  will be either subalgebras or consist of given random variables.)

Let  $B \subset M$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra and consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$ . Recall [10] that the *conjugate variables of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with respect to  $B$* ,  $J_1 = J_1(X_1, \dots, X_n : B), \dots, J_n = J_n(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$ , are determined by the requirements that they belong to  $L^2(X_1, \dots, X_n, B)$  and that they fulfill the following system of equations:

$$(4.1) \quad \tau(J_i b_1 X_{i_1} b_2 X_{i_2} b_3 \cdots b_m X_{i_m} b_{m+1}) = \sum_{r=1}^m \delta_{ii_r} \cdot \tau(b_1 X_{i_1} b_2 \cdots b_{r-1} X_{i_{r-1}} b_r) \cdot \tau(b_{r+1} X_{i_{r+1}} b_{r+2} \cdots b_m X_{i_m} b_{m+1})$$

for all  $m \geq 0$ , all  $b_1, \dots, b_{m+1} \in B$ , and all  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_m \leq n$ . The equations for  $m = 0$  are to be understood as

$$(4.2) \quad \tau(J_i b) = 0$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and all  $b \in B$ .

Furthermore, if a system of conjugate variables  $J_1, \dots, J_n$  for  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with respect to  $B$  exists (in which case it is unique and satisfies  $J_i = J_i^*$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), then Voiculescu defined

$$(4.3) \quad \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) := \sum_{i=1}^n \|J_i\|_{L^2(\varphi)}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(J_i^2)$$

and called it the *relative free information with respect to  $B$* . If no system of conjugate variables exist, then he put  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) := \infty$ .

**4.2. Reformulation in terms of cumulants.** It is quite easy to check that the above equations can also be rewritten in terms of scalar-valued cumulants  $\kappa = \kappa^{\mathbb{C}}$  in the equivalent form:

$$(4.4) \quad \kappa(J_i) = 0$$

$$(4.5) \quad \kappa(J_i, a) = \delta_{a, X_i}$$

$$(4.6) \quad \kappa(J_i, a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0$$

for all  $m \geq 2$ , all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and all  $a, a_1, \dots, a_m \in \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \cup B$ .

If we are in the context of a  $B$ -valued probability space  $(M, E : M \rightarrow B)$  which is compatible with the scalar-valued probability structure, i.e.  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ , then the definition of the conjugate variables  $J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  has an operator-valued flavour and it seems conceivable that there should also exist a nice description of the determining equations in terms of  $B$ -valued cumulants. This is indeed the case, namely, as we will see below, we have:

$$(4.7) \quad \kappa^B(J_i) = 0$$

$$(4.8) \quad \kappa^B(J_i, bX_j) = \delta_{ij}\tau(b)$$

$$(4.9) \quad \kappa^B(J_i, b_1X_{i_1}, b_2X_{i_2}, \dots, b_mX_{i_m}) = 0$$

for all  $m \geq 2$ , all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , all  $b, b_1, \dots, b_m \in B$ , and all  $1 \leq j, i_1, \dots, i_m \leq n$ . Note the change of the role of the elements from  $B$ : from arguments in the scalar-valued cumulants to (non-commuting) constants in the  $B$ -valued cumulants.

These descriptions of the conjugate variables with respect to  $B$  in terms of the  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued and in terms of the  $B$ -valued distribution are the extreme cases of the following more general description in terms of the  $D$ -valued distribution for any intermediate subalgebra  $\mathbb{C} \subset D \subset B$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  and their conjugate variables  $J_i := J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  with respect to  $B$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Then the defining equations (4.1) for the  $J_i$  are equivalent to the following system of*

equations in terms of  $D$ -valued cumulants:

$$(4.10) \quad \kappa^D(J_i) = 0$$

$$(4.11) \quad \kappa^D(J_i, da) = \delta_{aX_i} \tau(d)$$

$$(4.12) \quad \kappa^D(J_i, d_1 a_1, \dots, d_m a_m) = 0$$

for all  $m \geq 2$ , all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , all  $d, d_1, \dots, d_m \in D$ , and all  $a, a_1, \dots, a_m \in \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \cup B$ .

Note that the traciality of  $\tau$  implies that we have for all  $r \geq 2$  and all  $m_1, \dots, m_r \in M$

$$(4.13) \quad \tau(\kappa^D(m_1, \dots, m_r)) = \tau(\kappa^D(m_2, \dots, m_r, m_1)).$$

Together with the faithfulness of  $\tau$  this yields that we have the same kind of formulas as in Theorem 4.1 also in the cases where  $J_i$  is not the first argument of a cumulant  $\kappa^D$ , but appears at an arbitrary position.

*Proof.* It is easy to see that, by the moment-cumulant formula (2.2), the Equations (4.10) - (4.12) are equivalent to

$$E(J_i d_1 a_1 \cdots d_m a_m) = \sum_{r=1}^m \delta_{a_r X_i} \cdot \tau(d_1 a_1 \cdots d_r) \cdot E(d_{r+1} a_{r+1} \cdots d_m a_m)$$

for all  $m \geq 0$ , all  $d_1, \dots, d_m \in D$  and all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \cup B$ . Since  $\tau$  is faithful and  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ , this is equivalent to

$$\tau(J_i d_1 a_1 \cdots d_m a_m d_{m+1}) = \sum_{r=1}^m \delta_{a_r X_i} \cdot \tau(d_1 a_1 \cdots d_r) \cdot \tau(d_{r+1} a_{r+1} \cdots d_m a_m d_{m+1})$$

for all  $m \geq 0$ , all  $d_1, \dots, d_m, d_{m+1} \in D$  and all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \cup B$ . But this is clearly the same as (4.1).  $\square$

**4.3. Relation between  $\Phi^*(X : D)$  and  $\Phi^*(X : B)$ .** Our aim will be to investigate, for given random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$ , the relation between their Fisher informations with respect to two different subalgebras. If we have  $D \subset B \subset M$ , then the following facts are known from [10, 11, 6]:

- (i) We always have:  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D) \leq \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$ .
- (ii) If  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ , then we have equality:  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D) = \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$ .
- (iii) If  $D = \mathbb{C}$ , then the reverse implication of (ii) holds: If  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) = \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n) < \infty$ , then we have that  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  (i.e. free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $\mathbb{C}$ ).

The question which we want to address is whether the statement (iii) also holds for more general  $D$ , i.e. is it true that  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) = \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D)$  implies that  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ . We will be able to show that this is true for finite-dimensional  $D$ .

The techniques for proving this are operator-valued generalizations of Voiculescu's ideas [11] for dealing with the special case  $D = \mathbb{C}$ . The main conceptual ingredient

will be an operator-valued version of the liberation gradient, which we present in the next section.

## 5. OPERATOR-VALUED LIBERATION GRADIENT

**5.1. Definition and basic properties.** In [11], Voiculescu introduced the notion  $\varphi^*(A_1, A_2)$  of liberation Fisher information, which is a measure for how far two  $*$ -subalgebras  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space are away from being free. As in the case of the free Fisher information this liberation Fisher information is given by the square of the  $L^2$ -norm of a special vector in  $L^2(A_1, A_2)$ , namely of the so-called liberation gradient  $j(A_1 : A_2)$ . The defining property for this liberation gradient  $j$  is in terms of a canonical derivation  $\delta$ . The definition of Voiculescu is recovered as the case  $B = \mathbb{C}$  and  $E = \tau$  of our following operator-valued generalizations.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space, and let  $E : M \rightarrow B$  be a conditional expectation with  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Consider two subalgebras  $A_1, A_2$ , both of them containing  $B$  as a subalgebra,  $B \subset A_1, A_2 \subset M$ , which are algebraically free modulo  $B$  (i.e., the canonical homomorphism  $A_1 *_B A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \vee A_2$  has trivial kernel). 1) Denote by  $A = A_1 \vee A_2$  the algebra generated by  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . We define

$$(5.1) \quad \delta_{A_1:A_2} : A \rightarrow A \otimes_B A$$

to be the derivation into the  $A$ -bimodule  $A \otimes_B A$  which is determined by

$$(5.2) \quad \delta_{A_1:A_2}(a) = \begin{cases} a \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes a, & \text{if } a \in A_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } a \in A_2 \end{cases}$$

2) We define the  $B$ -valued liberation gradient  $j := j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  by the requirements that it is a vector in  $L^2(A_1, A_2)$  and that we have for all  $a \in A_1 \vee A_2$

$$(5.3) \quad E(ja) = E \otimes E(\delta_{A_1:A_2}(a)).$$

3) We define the  $B$ -valued liberation Fisher information by

$$(5.4) \quad \varphi_B^*(A_1 : A_2) := \begin{cases} \|j_B(A_1 : A_2)\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2, & \text{if } j_B(A_1 : A_2) \text{ exists} \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Remarks 5.2.* 1) It is easy to see that the relations  $E(ja) = E \otimes E(\delta_B(a))$  have the following explicit form:

$$(5.5) \quad E(jc_1 \tilde{c}_1 c_2 \tilde{c}_2 \dots c_m \tilde{c}_m) = \sum_{r=1}^m (E(c_1 \tilde{c}_1 \dots \tilde{c}_{r-1} c_r) E(\tilde{c}_r c_{r+1} \tilde{c}_{r+1} \dots c_m \tilde{c}_m) - E(c_1 \tilde{c}_1 \dots c_{r-1} \tilde{c}_{r-1}) E(c_r \tilde{c}_r \dots c_m \tilde{c}_m))$$

for all  $m \geq 0$  and all  $c_1, \dots, c_m \in A_1$ ,  $\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_m \in A_2$ . (The case  $m = 0$  has then to be interpreted as  $E(j) = 0$ .)

2) Note that if a liberation gradient exists, then it is uniquely determined by the

above requirements.

3) Since, for  $b \in B = A_1 \cap A_2$ , we have

$$0 = \delta_{A_1:A_2}(b) = b \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes b,$$

it is clear that  $\delta_{A_1:A_2}$  has to take values in  $A \otimes_B A$ , and not just in  $A \otimes A$ .

It will be quite instructive to characterize the liberation gradient in terms of  $B$ -valued cumulants.

**Theorem 5.3.** *The equations (5.3) in the definition of the operator-valued liberation gradient are equivalent to the following system of equations in terms of  $B$ -valued cumulants:*

$$(5.6) \quad \kappa^B(j) = 0$$

and, for all  $m \geq 1$  and all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A_1 \cup A_2$ ,

$$(5.7) \quad \kappa^B(j, a_1, \dots, a_m) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a_1, a_m \in A_1 \text{ or if } a_1, a_m \in A_2 \\ -\kappa^B(a_1, \dots, a_m), & \text{if } a_1 \in A_1 \text{ and } a_m \in A_2 \\ +\kappa^B(a_1, \dots, a_m), & \text{if } a_1 \in A_2 \text{ and } a_m \in A_1 \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let us denote in the following by  $\kappa^B \otimes \kappa^B$  the family of multi-linear mappings with one argument from  $A \otimes_B A$  and all other arguments from  $A$ , which are determined as follows:

$$(5.8) \quad \kappa^B \otimes \kappa^B(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a \otimes \hat{a}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m) := \kappa^B(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a) \cdot \kappa^B(\hat{a}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m).$$

for all  $m \geq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $a_1, \dots, a, \hat{a}, \dots, a_m \in A$ . Then, by using the moment-cumulant formula (2.2), one can check that the system of equations  $E(ja) = E \otimes E(\delta(a))$  is equivalent to the system of equations

$$(5.9) \quad \kappa^B(j, a_1, \dots, a_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \kappa^B \otimes \kappa^B(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, \delta a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m)$$

for all  $m \geq 0$  and all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A_1 \vee A_2$ .

If the  $a_i$  appearing in Eq. (5.9) are from  $A_1 \cup A_2$ , then this equation reduces drastically due to the following observations: If  $i \neq 1$  and  $i \neq m$ , then we have for  $a_i \in A_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^B(\dots, \delta a_i, \dots) &= \kappa^B(\dots, a_i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes a_i, \dots) \\ &= \kappa^B(\dots, a_i) \cdot \kappa^B(1, \dots) - \kappa^B(\dots, 1) \cdot \kappa^B(a_i, \dots), \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to zero, because cumulants of length greater than 1 where one entry is equal to 1 must vanish. Since for  $a_i \in A_2$  the term  $\delta a_i$  vanishes always, we have in any case that the terms with  $1 < i < m$  vanish. On the other hand, if  $m > 1$ , we have for the two remaining terms

$$\kappa^B(\delta a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m) = \begin{cases} -\kappa^B(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m), & \text{if } a_1 \in A_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } a_1 \in A_2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\kappa^B(a_1, a_2, \dots, \delta a_m) = \begin{cases} \kappa^B(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m), & \text{if } a_m \in A_1 \\ 0, & \text{if } a_m \in A_2 \end{cases}.$$

If  $m = 1$ , then we have  $\kappa^B(\delta a) = 0$  for all  $a \in A_1 \cup A_2$ .

Putting all these observations together gives the assertion.  $\square$

This theorem yields directly, by the fact that freeness is equivalent to the vanishing of mixed cumulants (see Theorem 2.5), the following fundamental characterization of freeness with amalgamation in terms of the operator-valued liberation gradient.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space, and let  $E : M \rightarrow B$  be a conditional expectation with  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Consider two subalgebras  $A_1, A_2$ , both of them containing  $B$  as a subalgebra,  $B \subset A_1, A_2 \subset M$ , which are algebraically free modulo  $B$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are free with amalgamation over  $B$ .
- (ii)  $j_B(A_1 : A_2) = 0$

*Remarks 5.5.* 1) The characterization of  $j$  in terms of cumulants shows quite clearly that  $j$  contains the information about the mutual position of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , but that it ignores the information about the internal structure of  $A_1$  and of  $A_2$ .

2) If  $j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  exists, then so does  $j_B(A_2 : A_1)$ , and we have the equality

$$(5.10) \quad j_B(A_1 : A_2) = -j_B(A_2 : A_1).$$

This could be easily checked from the definition, but is strikingly clear from Eq. (5.7).

3) It is clear that  $j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  fulfills also the defining relations for  $j_B(\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)$  if  $\tilde{A}_1 \subset A_1$  and  $\tilde{A}_2 \subset A_2$ . Thus we get  $j_B(\tilde{A}_1 : \tilde{A}_2)$  in this situation by projecting  $j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  onto  $L^2(\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)$ .

4) Instead of changing  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  it will be more relevant for our questions how  $j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  behaves if we change the subalgebra  $B$  (a more precise description of the framework for that question will be given in Theorem 5.8). A first hint that there might be a relation between  $j_D$  and  $j_B$  is given by the following observation: Assume we have two unital subalgebras with  $D \subset B$ , such that  $E_D \circ E_B = E_D$ . Then the defining relations for  $j := j_D(A_1, A_2)$ ,  $E_D(ja) = E_D \otimes E_D(\delta a)$ , can also be formulated equivalently with respect to  $E_B$ :

$$(5.11) \quad E_B(ja) = E_D \otimes E_B(\delta a).$$

**Proposition 5.6.** *If  $j_B(A_1 : A_2)$  exists then it belongs to the  $\|\cdot\|_2$ -closure of the relative commutant  $B' \cap M$ .*

*Proof.* We have to show that, for any  $b \in B$ , we have the equality

$$\tau(jbc_1\tilde{c}_1 \cdots c_m\tilde{c}_m) = \tau(jc_1\tilde{c}_1 \cdots c_m\tilde{c}_mb)$$

for all  $m \geq 0$  and all  $c_1, \dots, c_m \in A_1$ ,  $\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_m \in A_2$ . But this follows directly from applying  $\tau$  to the equation (5.5).  $\square$



*Remarks 5.7.* 1) The last proposition shows that the definition of  $j_B$  is in general quite restrictive. In the case of infinite-dimensional  $B$  the relative commutant of  $B$  might just consist of scalar multiples of the identity, in which case we are only left with the dichotomy that either  $j_B(A_1 : A_2) = 0$  (and thus  $A_1, A_2$  are free with amalgamation over  $B$ ) or they are so far apart from being free over  $B$  that no  $j$  exists, i.e. the  $B$ -valued liberation Fisher information is either zero or infinity.

2) Prop. 5.6 suggests that, in the situation  $D \subset B$ , one might get  $j_B$  from  $j_D$  by projecting it onto the relative commutant of  $B$ . In the case of finite dimensional  $D$  we will make this rigorous in the next section.

**5.2. Relation between  $j$  and  $J$  in the case of finite-dimensional  $D$ .** In this section we will make the additional assumption that  $D$  is finite-dimensional. This has the effect that there exist explicit formulas for the conditional expectations  $E_D$  and  $E_{D'}$  onto  $D$  and onto the relative commutant  $D' \cap M$ , respectively.

We denote the group of unitary elements in  $D$  by  $U$ . This is a compact group, and we will denote integration with respect to its normalized Haar measure by "du". Then there exists a positive, invertible and central element of  $D$ , which we will denote by  $c$  in the following, such that the following integral formulas hold for all  $m \in M$ :

$$(5.12) \quad E_D(m) = \dim(D) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \int_U u \tau(u^* m) du$$

$$(5.13) \quad E_{D'}(m) = \int_U u m u^* du.$$

The role of  $c$  in the formula (5.12) is to correct the way how  $\tau$  partitions the unit between the minimal central projections of  $D$ . To be precise, suppose that

$$D \cong M_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C}),$$

and let  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  denote the minimal central projections of  $D$ . Then  $c$  is given as

$$c := (n_1^2 + \cdots + n_k^2) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\tau(p_j)}{n_j^2} p_j.$$

The verification of the above integration formulas is straightforward. They allow us to formulate and prove our main result about the connection between the liberation gradient and the conjugate variable. This will be a corollary of the following statement which clarifies the relation between  $j_C$  and  $j_D$ .

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $D \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider two unital subalgebras  $A_1, A_2 \subset M$  with  $D \subset A_2$  (but not  $D \subset A_1$ ). Assume that  $\dim(D) < \infty$ . If  $j_C(A_1 : A_2)$  exists, then  $j_D(A_1 \vee D : A_2)$  exists, too, and is given by*

$$(5.14) \quad j_D(A_1 \vee D : A_2) = E_{D'}(j_C(A_1 : A_2)) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D).$$

*Proof.* Let us denote

$$j := E_{D'}(j_C(A_1 : A_2)) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) = \int_U u j_C(A_1 : A_2) u^* du \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D).$$

Since this belongs to  $L^2(D, A_1, A_2)$ , it only remains to check the defining relations (5.3) for  $j$ . Let  $a \in A_1 \vee A_2$ , then we have (with  $E = E_D$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
E(ja) &= \int E(uj_{\mathbb{C}}(A_1 : A_2)u^*a)du \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\
&= \int u \cdot E(j_{\mathbb{C}}(A_1 : A_2)u^*a)du \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\
&= \int u \cdot \tau \otimes E(\delta_{A_1:A_2}(u^*a))du \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\
&= \int u \cdot \tau \otimes E(u^*\delta_{A_1:A_2}(a))du \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\
&= E \otimes E(\delta_{A_1 \vee D:A_2}(a)),
\end{aligned}$$

which yields the assertion.

(One should note that  $\delta_{A_1:A_2}(u^*) = 0$ , because  $u^* \in A_2$ , and that on  $A_1 \vee A_2$  we can identify  $\delta_{A_1:A_2}$  canonically with  $\delta_{A_1 \vee D:A_2}$ .)  $\square$

In the following, we will denote, for given random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and a subalgebra  $D$ , by  $D\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$  the algebra generated by  $D$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ; the elements of  $D\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$  can be considered as non-commutative polynomials in  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with coefficients from  $D$ .

**Corollary 5.9.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) < \infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim(D) < \infty$ . Then the  $D$ -valued liberation gradient of the pair  $D\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$  and  $B$  exists and is given by*

$$(5.15) \quad j_D(D\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle : B) = E_{D'}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B), X_i]\right) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D).$$

*Proof.* This follows from combining the above theorem with Voiculescu's formula [11],

$$j_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle : B) = \sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B), X_i].$$

$\square$

**Corollary 5.10.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) < \infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim(D) < \infty$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $E_{D'}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B), X_i]\right) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

*Proof.* This is just a combination of Theorem 5.9 with Corollary 5.4.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.11.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space. Let  $D \subset M$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim(D) < \infty$ . Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  and assume that  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D) < \infty$ . Then we have*

$$(5.16) \quad E_{D'}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : D), X_i]\right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that the freeness condition in Corollary 5.10 is trivially fulfilled for  $B = D$ .  $\square$

## 6. FREENESS FROM A SUBALGEBRA AND EQUALITY OF FISHER INFORMATIONS

**6.1. Main results.** We are now ready to state our second main result of this note.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $A, B \subset M$  unital  $*$ -subalgebras which are algebraically free. Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . If  $j_{\mathbb{C}}(A : B)$  exists, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $j_{\mathbb{C}}(A : D) = j_{\mathbb{C}}(A : B)$ .
- (ii)  $A$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

*Proof.* (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): This is Prop. 5.13 from [11].

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Theorem 5.9 and Corollary 5.11 yield

$$\begin{aligned} j_D(A \vee D : B) &= E_{D'}(j_{\mathbb{C}}(A : B)) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\ &= E_{D'}(j_{\mathbb{C}}(A : D)) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot \dim(D) \\ &= j_D(A \vee D : D) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the vanishing of  $j_D(A \vee D : D)$  follows from the fact that  $A$  and  $D$  are clearly free with amalgamation over  $D$ .

This gives statement (ii) by the fact that the vanishing of the liberation gradient is equivalent to freeness (Corollary 5.4).  $\square$

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) < \infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D) = \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

*Proof.* Since  $J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : D)$  is obtained in general by projecting  $J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  onto  $L^2(X_1, \dots, X_n, D)$ , the statement (i) can also be reformulated as

$$(i') \quad J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : D) = J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since the implication  $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$  follows from [6], we only have to consider the implication  $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ . Let us assume  $(i')$ . By [11], we know that

$$\begin{aligned} j_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle : D) &= \sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : D), X_i] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n [J_i(X_1, \dots, X_n : B), X_i] \\ &= j_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle : B). \end{aligned}$$

Thus Theorem 6.1 gives the assertion.  $\square$

In the same way as for [11], Prop.5.18, we get the following consequence.

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space. Let  $D \subset M$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in M$  with  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n : D) < \infty$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n : D) = \Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_m : D) + \Phi^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_n : D)$
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$  and  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$  are free with amalgamation over  $D$ .

**6.2. Maximization of free entropy.** Recall that, given a  $D$ -probability space  $(M, E_D : M \rightarrow D)$ , the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $n$  random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  is given by the moment series of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , i.e., it consists of the collection of all  $D$ -valued moments  $E_D(d_0 X_{i_1} d_1 \cdots X_{i_{m-1}} d_{m-1} X_{i_m} d_m)$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , all  $d_1, \dots, d_m \in D$ , and all  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_m \leq n$ . Since the free Fisher information  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D)$  with respect to  $D$  depends only on the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , we can interpret Theorem 6.2 also as a result about the minimization of free Fisher informations in the following form.

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) < \infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\Phi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  is minimal among  $\Phi^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_n : B)$  for all  $B$ -valued random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  which have the same  $D$ -valued distribution as  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

It is even more striking to formulate this statement in a dual version as a maximization result for free entropy. Let us first recall that – for a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space  $(M, \tau)$ , a unital  $*$ -subalgebra  $B \subset M$ , and selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  – the relative free entropy  $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  with respect to  $B$

is defined as (see [10])

$$(6.1) \quad \chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{n}{1+t} - \Phi^*(X_1 + \sqrt{t}S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t}S_n : B) \right) dt + \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi e),$$

where the  $S_j$ 's are  $(0, 1)$ -semicircular and  $B\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle, \{S_1\}, \dots, \{S_n\}$  are free.

**Theorem 6.5.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) > -\infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) = \chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : D)$ .
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

*Proof.* That the freeness condition implies equality of the entropies is contained in [6], so we only have to prove the other implication. One should note that one can use the same set of semicirculars  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  for dealing with the free entropy with respect to  $B$  as well as with the free entropy with respect to  $D$ . But then the assumption (i) implies that we have the equality

$$\Phi^*(X_1 + \sqrt{t}S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t}S_n : B) = \Phi^*(X_1 + \sqrt{t}S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t}S_n : D)$$

for almost all  $t > 0$ . By our corresponding result for the free Fisher information, Theorem 6.2, this implies that  $\{X_1 + \sqrt{t}S_1, \dots, X_n + \sqrt{t}S_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  for almost all  $t > 0$ . By letting  $t \rightarrow 0$  and by using the continuity of the moments in  $t$ , we get the assertion.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.6.** *Let  $(M, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and  $B \subset M$  a unital  $*$ -subalgebra. Consider selfadjoint random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in M$  with  $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B) > -\infty$ . Let  $D \subset B$  be a unital  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B$  with conditional expectation  $E : M \rightarrow D$  such that  $\tau \circ E = \tau$ . Assume that  $\dim D < \infty$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\chi^*(X_1, \dots, X_n : B)$  is maximal among  $\chi^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_n : B)$  for all  $B$ -valued random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  which have the same  $D$ -valued distribution as  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .

**6.3.  $D \subset B$ -Haar unitary elements.** It is to be expected (but still unproven) that in general the definition for  $\chi^*$  agrees with the one coming from the microstates approach and thus  $\chi^*$  should be a measure of the randomness of the given distribution. In that interpretation the above statement is quite plausible: maximal randomness for the  $B$ -valued distribution under the constraint of a fixed  $D$ -valued distribution is achieved by making the variables as free as possible from  $B$  modulo the given constraint (i.e. free with amalgamation over  $D$ ).

One should note that fixing the  $D$ -valued distribution and requiring that the variables are free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  determines uniquely the  $B$ -valued

distribution. Thus for each  $D$ -valued distribution there is exactly one  $B$ -valued distribution with maximal entropy. In this context the question arises whether there is an explicit way of realizing the situation with maximal entropy. A universal way of doing so is by conjugating with a  $D \subset B$ -version of a Haar unitary

**Definition 6.7.** A unitary  $u$  is called a  $D \subset B$ -Haar unitary element, if the following requirements are fulfilled:

- (i)  $\{u, u^*\}$  commutes with  $D$
- (ii)  $E_D(u^k) = \delta_{k0}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$
- (iii)  $\{u, u^*\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$

The last two requirements determine the  $B$ -valued distribution of  $u, u^*$  uniquely, and the first condition has the effect that conjugating with  $u$  does not change the  $D$ -valued distribution.

**Proposition 6.8.** Consider a  $B$ -valued random variable  $X$  and choose a  $D \subset B$ -Haar unitary  $u$  such that  $\{u, u^*\}$  is free from  $X$  with amalgamation over  $B$ . Put  $Y := uXu^*$ . Then the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $Y$  is the same as the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X$ , but  $Y$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ , i.e.,  $Y$  maximizes the free entropy with respect to  $B$  under all variables which have the same  $D$ -valued distribution as  $X$ .

*Proof.* We have to check that  $Y$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ . By our assumptions, we have that  $X$  is free from  $\{u, u^*\}$  with amalgamation over  $B$  and that  $\{u, u^*\}$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ . But then a slightly modified version of our Corollary 3.8 implies that  $B\langle X \rangle$  is free from  $\{u, u^*\}$  with amalgamation over  $D$ . Then it follows directly from the definition of freeness that  $uXu^*$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$ .  $\square$

In some sense, conjugating with  $u$  can be considered as a random rotation of the degrees of freedom of  $X$  which are not fixed by the  $D$ -valued distribution. Similar constructions are possible for more than one variable.

**6.4. Example:  $R$ -cyclic matrices.** The motivating example for our investigations on equality of Fisher informations for different subalgebras was the following special case:  $M = M_d(A) = M_d(\mathbb{C}) \otimes A$ ,  $B = M_d(\mathbb{C})$ , and  $D \subset B$  is the unital  $*$ -algebra of constant diagonal matrices, i.e.

$$D = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \alpha_d \end{pmatrix} \mid \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

In this case, our random variables  $X \in M$  are  $d \times d$ -matrices with entries from  $A$ ,

$$X = (x_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d \quad \text{with} \quad x_{ij} \in A,$$

and statements about operator-valued properties of  $X$  can also be reformulated as scalar-valued properties of the entries  $x_{ij}$ .

It is quite instructive to see that in this case the  $B$ -valued distribution of  $X = (x_{ij})$  is the same as the joint distribution of all entries (i.e., the collection of all possible

moments of the  $x_{ij}$ ), whereas the  $D$ -valued distribution of  $X$  is given by the collection of all cyclic moments of the  $x_{ij}$ , i.e. by all moments of the form  $\tau(x_{i_1 i_2} x_{i_2 i_3} \cdots x_{i_n i_1})$  for all integer  $n$  and all  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_n \leq d$ .

In [3], we showed that the statement  $X = (x_{ij})$  is free from  $B$  with amalgamation over  $D$  is equivalent to the fact that the family  $\{x_{ij} \mid i, j = 1 \dots d\}$  is  $R$ -cyclic, which means the following: all cumulants  $\kappa_n(x_{i_1 j_1}, x_{i_2 j_2}, \dots, x_{i_n j_n})$  vanish for which it is not true that  $j_1 = i_2, j_2 = i_3, \dots, j_n = i_1$ .

Furthermore, in [2], we showed that the operator-valued free Fisher information  $\Phi^*(X : M_d(\mathbb{C}))$  of the matrix  $X$  with respect to  $M_d(\mathbb{C})$  is, up to a factor  $d^3$ , the same as the scalar-valued free Fisher information  $\Phi^*(x_{ij} \mid i, j = 1, \dots, d)$  of the entries of the matrix  $X$  (where we used a slight extension of the definition of  $\Phi^*$  to the case where some of the arguments are not self-adjoint itself, but come always in pairs with their adjoint).

Thus, in this special case, we can rewrite Corollary 6.6 from operator-valued properties of the matrix  $X = (x_{ij})$  to a form which involves only scalar-valued properties of the entries  $x_{ij}$ . Of course, a similar version holds for minimization of  $\Phi^*$  instead of maximization of  $\chi^*$ .

**Corollary 6.9.** *Let  $(A, \tau)$  be a tracial  $W^*$ -probability space and consider random variables  $x_{ij} \in A$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ ) with  $\chi^*(\{x_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d) > -\infty$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\chi^*(\{x_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d)$  is minimal among  $\chi^*(\{y_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d)$  for all  $\{y_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d$  which have the same cyclic moments as  $\{x_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d$ .
- (ii) The family  $\{x_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d$  is  $R$ -cyclic.

One should also note that in this case a  $D \subset B$ -Haar unitary element  $u$  is given by a diagonal matrix whose non-vanishing entries are free Haar unitaries. The condition that such a  $u$  is free from  $X$  with amalgamation over  $B$  just means that all entries of  $u$  are free from all entries of  $X$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Nica, *R-transforms of free joint distributions and non-crossing partitions*, J. Funct. Anal. **135** (1996), 271–296.
- [2] A. Nica, D. Shlyakhtenko, and R. Speicher, *Some minimization problems for the free analogue of the Fisher information*, Adv. Math. **141**, (1999), 282–321.
- [3] ———, *R-cyclic families of matrices in free probability*, to appear in J. Funct. Anal.
- [4] D. Shlyakhtenko, *Random Gaussian band matrices and freeness with amalgamation*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **20** (1996), 1013–1026.
- [5] ———, *Some applications of freeness with amalgamation*, J. reine angew. Math. **500** (1998), 191–212.
- [6] ———, *Free entropy with respect to a completely positive map*, Amer. J. Math. **122** (2000), no. 1, 45–81.
- [7] R. Speicher, *Multiplicative functions on the lattice of non-crossing partitions and free convolution*, Math. Annalen **298** (1994), 193–206.
- [8] ———, *Combinatorial theory of the free product with amalgamation and operator-valued free probability theory*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **132** (1998), x+88.
- [9] D. Voiculescu, *Operations on certain non-commutative operator-valued random variables*, Recent advances in operator algebras (Orléans, 1992), no. 232, Astérisque, 1995, pp. 243–275.

- [10] ———, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory: V. Noncommutative Hilbert transforms*, Invent. Math. **132** (1998), 182–227.
- [11] ———, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory: VI. Liberation and mutual free information*, Adv. Math. **146** (1999), 101–166.
- [12] D.-V. Voiculescu, K. Dykema, and A. Nica, *Free random variables*, CRM monograph series, vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, 1992.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, ONTARIO,  
N2L 3G1, CANADA

*E-mail address:* `anica@math.uwaterloo.ca`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA

*E-mail address:* `shlyakht@math.ucla.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, ON-  
TARIO K7L 3N6, CANADA

*E-mail address:* `speicher@mast.queensu.ca`